

REMARKS

The Examiner's Action mailed on June 29, 2007 and Advisory Action mailed October 25, 2007, have been received and their contents carefully considered. Reconsideration of the final rejections presented therein is requested for at least the following reasons. A Request for Continued Examination is submitted herewith.

In this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, 17 and 18, cancelled claim 16 without prejudice and added new claims 19-22. Claims 1 and 10 are the independent claims, and claims 1, 4-15 and 17-22 are pending in the application. For at least the following reasons, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance.

Claim 1 was objected to for an informality in the final Office Action, and was amended accordingly in the Amendment filed October 1, 2007, which was not entered. However, this objection is now moot in light of the present Amendment.

Claims 1 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as anticipated by *Kawa et al.* (JP 2002-297309 A). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 1 recites "A notebook computer with a hidden touch pad, comprising: a main portion including a housing portion, wherein *the housing portion has an internal surface having a receiving portion comprising a concave portion*; a display connected to the main portion in a rotatable manner; and a touch pad disposed onto the concave portion; wherein the receiving portion of the internal surface prevents the touch pad from being exposed to an atmosphere

outside of the housing portion” (*emphasis added*). Support for this amendment can be found at page 2, lines 27-28: “The receiving portion has a concave portion formed on the internal surface of the housing” and in originally filed claim 16.

The Office Action states that FIG. 3(b) of *Kawa et al.* depicts an internal surface **54** having a receiving portion, but FIG. 3(b) of *Kawa et al.* depicts a flat internal surface **54**, and therefore *Kawa et al.* fails to teach or suggest “an internal surface having a receiving portion comprising a concave portion” as recited in claim 1.

Kawa et al. therefore fails to teach or suggest all the features recited in claim 1 of the present application, and the rejection under 35 USC §102(a) is thereby overcome.

For at least this reason, claim 1 patentably defines over *Kawa et al.*, and is allowable, together with claim 4 that depends therefrom.

Claims 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious solely over *Kawa et al.* This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 7-9 depend from claim 1, which is allowable, and therefore claims 7-9 are also allowable.

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over the combination of *Kawa et al.* and *Garner* (US 6,501,462 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 17 depends from claim 1, which is allowable, and as *Garner* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Kawa et al.* with respect to claim 1, therefore claim 17 is also allowable.

Claims 5, 6 and 10-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over the combination of *Kawa et al.* and *Keely, Jr. et al.* (US 2002/0063694 A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5 and 6 depend from claim 1, which is allowable, and as *Keely, Jr. et al.* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Kawa et al.* with respect to claim 1, therefore claims 5 and 6 are also allowable.

Independent claim 10 recites "A method for manufacturing a notebook computer with a hidden touch pad, comprising: forming a *housing having an internal surface having a receiving portion comprising a concave portion*; and adhering a touch pad onto the concave portion; wherein the receiving portion of the internal surface prevents the touch pad from being exposed to an atmosphere outside of the housing" (*emphasis added*). Support for this amendment can be found at page 2, lines 27-28: "The receiving portion has a concave portion formed on the internal surface of the housing" and in originally filed claim 16.

The Office Action states that FIG. 3(b) of *Kawa et al.* depicts an internal surface **54** having a receiving portion, but FIG. 3(b) of *Kawa et al.* depicts a flat internal surface **54**, and therefore *Kawa et al.* fails to teach or suggest "forming a housing having an internal surface having a *receiving portion comprising a concave portion*" as recited in claim 10. *Keely, Jr. et al.* is relied upon in the Office Action solely for the adhesive member disclosed in ¶[0041] thereof, and also fails to teach or suggest such a feature.

For at least these reasons, claim 10 patently defines over the cited art, and is allowable. Claims 11-16 depend from claim 10, and are allowable at least because claim 10 is allowable.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over the combination of *Kawa et al.* and *Garner* further in view of *Keely, Jr. et al.* This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 18 depends from claim 10, which is allowable, and as *Garner* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Kawa et al.* and *Keely, Jr. et al.* with respect to claim 10, therefore claim 18 is also allowable.

It is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Such action and the passing of this case to issue are requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a conference would help to expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned counsel to arrange for such an interview.

Should any fee be required, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee to our Deposit Account No. 18-0002, and advise us accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,



October 30, 2007
Date

Alun L. Palmer – Reg. No. 47,838
RABIN & BERDO, PC – Cust. No. 23995
Facsimile: 202-408-0924
Telephone: 202-371-8976

ALP/pq